

Impact of Age on the Development of Sharing Skills in School Going Children

Mr. Anoop Kumar Agarwal¹, Dr. Brajesh Kumar Mishra², Dr. Pramod Kumar Yadav³

Jaipur Occupational Therapy College(Maharaj Vinayak Global University), Jaipur¹²³

Abstract

Many parents believe that to succeed in society certain values and behaviors must be introduced to the offspring promptly. The more time a child has to spend learning a concept perhaps the better s/he will remember and practice it and the better off s/he will be in the future. One of the core societal values that parents try to teach their children early on is altruism (Eisenberg 1983). Children are often encouraged to share toys and food with siblings and playmates during playtimes as well as meal times.

The study aimed to compare the development of sharing skills in school-going children between the age group of 4-6 years. The study also aimed to compare the sharing skills among children belonging to joint and nuclear families. The study also aimed to find out the development of sharing skills across different socio-economic statuses.

A total of 227 school-going children attending between the age group of 4-6 years were taken up for the study, out of which there were 139 male children and 86 female children. A survey was done to find out the differences in sharing between children belonging to nuclear and joint families and different socio-economic statuses. The assessment consisted of two parts, the first part consisted of identification data which include information about the type of family and socio economical status of the family. The second part consisted of a questionnaire that was filled up by the teachers of the school.

The data collected from the schools were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 20). Data for different family types and different socioeconomic statuses were collected. The mean and standard deviation was found. An Independent T-Test was used to compare the scores of the joint family and nuclear family. One way Anova and post hoc analysis were done to compare the scores between the different socioeconomic statuses in both nuclear and joint families. The results were not found significant on the significance level $\alpha=0.05$ due to the small sample size and lots of variables that could not be controlled. Based on these results we can conclude that there is no difference in sharing between children belonging to different family types and belonging to different socio-economic strata. It was also found that sharing was the same in both educated and uneducated parents.

Keywords: School, Education, Skills, Development, Techniques, Impact, Children, Uneducated

Introduction

In today's parenting world, styles and strategies are based on the age-old question of nature Vs nurture. If the parents cannot affect the "nature" side of the equation that is their children's genetic inheritance In, then they will try to affect the "nurture" part by changing the way they raise their children to increase their children's chances of succeeding in society. Parents are always trying to find new ways and techniques to build the type of adult they want to see their child become. They want their children to be successful, caring, and accepted by society.

One of the core societal values that parents try to teach their children early is unselfish concern or altruism. Children are often encouraged to share toys with siblings and playmates and share their food with their parents during mealtimes. This sharing or unselfish concern must be intentional and voluntary action meant to benefit another being without obtaining any potential self-benefit (Eisenberg 1983).

Sharing in plain terms means the joint use of resources or space and Russell Davies in his study explained three types of sharing skills, (a) Sharing goods (b) Sharing Services and (c) Sharing Information. This sharing of goods, Davis claims, is the most difficult form of sharing because giving away physical items is immediately noticeable. Sharing services does not consist of losing tangible objects, but it can be considered inconvenient whereas sharing information, like giving directions, is not an inconvenience as it does not constitute loss of goods or time, thus it is in human nature to like to share information.

The development of adaptive skills has 6 sub-stages, S I Skill, Cognitive Skill, Dyadic interaction skill, Group interaction skill, Self-identity skill, and sexual identity skill. Dyadic interaction skill means the ability to participate in a variety of relationships, involving one other person. This skill will start developing at the age of 10 months and will go up to 30 years. At the age of 10 years to 14 years, the child should have the ability to interact in CHUM relationship. Chum is an agreement for sharing the apartment / another thing with a friend, while the payment has been made by both the party equally. It has been observed that the client, who is the only child and belongs to high socio economical status faces problems when they are forced to enter in chum relationship.

As the age increased, children were more likely to share toys and food and they share toys and food sooner in a sequence communicative way, there were no significant differences in sharing between children with and without a sibling. As family income rose younger children were less likely to share food. As parental education rose, all children shared toys more frequently but not toys. As parental altruism rose, younger children shared food more frequently. As parental affiliative tendency rose older children shared both toys and food less frequently. As parental other orientation socialization goals rose, older children shared food immediately at a higher rate. As parental obedience goals rose, younger children shared food less frequently. Together the result shows that multiple family-based correlates of early prosocial behavior and that those vary by the child 's age and what must be

shared (Sudipta Devanath).

Hence the study aimed to compare the development of sharing skills in school-going children between the age group of 4-6 years belonging to joint and nuclear families. The study also aimed to find out the development of sharing skills across different socio-economic statuses.

Hypothesis

Alternate Hypothesis (Experimental Hypothesis)—

- 1 Children belonging to a joint family are having same sharing skills in comparison with children belonging to a nuclear family.
- 2 Children belonging to high socio economical status are having same sharing skills in comparison to low socio economical status.

Null Hypothesis ----

- 1 - Children belonging to the joint family are having better sharing skills in comparison with children belonging to the nuclear family
- 2 children belonging to the low socio economical group are having better sharing skills in comparison with children belonging to the high socio economical group.

Methodology

A total of 227 school-going children attending DAV (117) and South Delhi Public school (110) between the age group of 3-5 years were taken up for the study, out of which there were 139 male children and 86 female children.

A survey type of pilot project was done to find out the differences in sharing between children belonging to nuclear and joint families and different socio-economic statuses.

The assessment consisted of two parts, the first part consisted of identification data (Appendix III) which include information about the type of family and socio economical status of the family. Written consent was taken from the principal of the school (Appendix I) and parents (Appendix II) to include their child in the proposed study.

The second part of the assessment included a questionnaire that was developed to assess the sharing skills in children as no questionnaire was available to date to evaluate the sharing skills. The questionnaire included the 10 most items prone to be shared by the students of the nursery class. It consisted of the following items,

- Food
- Water
- Pencil
- Eraser
- Color
- Book
- Notebook
- Play Item
- Seating space in class

Seating space on the bus

The scoring pattern for the above-mentioned scale is as follows,

- 1 Always share spontaneously with everyone 10
- 2 Always share spontaneously MAJOR PORTION with everyone 9
- 3 Always share spontaneously SOME with everyone 8
- 4 Always share when hinted ALL with every one 7
- 5 Always share when hinted MAJOR PORTION with everyone (06)
- 6. Always share when hinted SOME with everyone (05)
- 7. Always share when requested ALL with everyone (04)
- 8. Always share when requested MAJOR PORTION with everyone (03)
- 9. Always share when requested SOME with everyone (02)
- 10. NEVER share with anyone (01)

Data analysis

The data collected from the schools were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 20). Data for different family types and different socioeconomic statuses were collected. The mean and standard deviation was found. An Independent T-Test was used to compare the scores of the joint family and nuclear family (Table 1 & Table 2). One way Anova and post hoc analysis were done to compare the scores between the different socioeconomic statuses in both nuclear and joint families (Table 3).

Table 1

Independent Samples Test		
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means
	F	Sig.
		t

Food	Equal variances assumed	.344	.558	-.394
	Equal variances not assumed			-.393
Water	Equal variances assumed	2.089	.150	-.110
	Equal variances not assumed			-.109
Pencil	Equal variances assumed	3.662	.057	-.987
	Equal variances not assumed			-.981
Eraser	Equal variances assumed	1.954	.164	-.100
	Equal variances not assumed			-.100
Color	Equal variances assumed	1.866	.173	-.093
	Equal variances not assumed			-.092
Book	Equal variances assumed	.960	.328	.889
	Equal variances not assumed			.892
Note Book	Equal variances assumed	.374	.542	-.305
	Equal variances not assumed			-.304
Play Item	Equal variances assumed	.002	.964	1.376
	Equal variances not assumed			1.376
Sitting space in the class	Equal variances assumed	2.321	.129	.959
	Equal variances not assumed			.961

Table 2

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Food	Equal variances assumed	219	.694	-.142
	Equal variances not assumed	215.621	.694	-.142
Water	Equal variances assumed	219	.913	-.048
	Equal variances not assumed	212.431	.913	-.048
Pencil	Equal variances assumed	219	.325	-.296
	Equal variances not assumed	205.631	.328	-.296
Eraser	Equal variances assumed	219	.920	-.034
	Equal variances not assumed	210.528	.921	-.034
Color	Equal variances assumed	219	.926	-.030
	Equal variances not assumed	211.774	.927	-.030
Book	Equal variances assumed	219	.375	.318
	Equal variances not assumed	218.833	.373	.318
Note Book	Equal variances assumed	219	.761	-.129
	Equal variances not assumed	216.582	.761	-.129
Play Item	Equal variances assumed	219	.170	.594
	Equal variances not assumed	217.738	.170	.594
Sitting space in the class	Equal variances assumed	219	.339	.433
	Equal variances not assumed	219.000	.338	.433

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Food	Between Groups	38.288	2	19.144	2.710
	Within Groups	1540.255	218	7.065	
	Total	1578.543	220		
Water	Between Groups	57.351	2	28.676	2.821
	Within Groups	2215.961	218	10.165	
	Total	2273.312	220		
Pencil	Between Groups	.079	2	.039	.008
	Within Groups	1094.980	218	5.023	
	Total	1095.059	220		
Eraser	Between Groups	9.097	2	4.549	.713
	Within Groups	1391.020	218	6.381	

	Total	1400.118	220		
Color	Between Groups	5.996	2	2.998	.514
	Within Groups	1272.293	218	5.836	
	Total	1278.290	220		
Book	Between Groups	20.204	2	10.102	1.441
	Within Groups	1527.959	218	7.009	
	Total	1548.163	220		
Note Book	Between Groups	19.358	2	9.679	.977
	Within Groups	2159.248	218	9.905	
	Total	2178.606	220		
Play Item	Between Groups	11.924	2	5.962	.575
	Within Groups	2260.764	218	10.370	
	Total	2272.688	220		
Sitting space in the class	Between Groups	16.755	2	8.377	.744
	Within Groups	2455.055	218	11.262	
	Total	2471.810	220		
Sitting space in the Bus/Van	Between Groups	3.464	2	1.732	.127
	Within Groups	2964.238	218	13.597	
	Total	2967.701	220		

Table 3

ANOVA		Sig.
Food	Between Groups	.069
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Water	Between Groups	.062
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Pencil	Between Groups	.992
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Eraser	Between Groups	.491
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Color	Between Groups	.599
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Book	Between Groups	.239
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Note Book	Between Groups	.378
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Play Item	Between Groups	.564
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Sitting space in the class	Between Groups	.476
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Sitting space in the Bus/Van	Between Groups	.880
	Within Groups	
	Total	

Discussion

The purpose of the study was to find out whether sharing in children differs from different types of families ie either joint or nuclear families and also according to the difference in socioeconomic status. It was hypothesized whether children from lower socioeconomic status have the same amount of sharing skills as compared to those children belonging to higher socio strata and

also children from joint families have equal sharing skills when compared to the children of nuclear families. It was also pertinent to find out whether children with siblings have similar sharing skills compared to single children. It was expected that the children shared toys and food with others as their age increased. The results of the study indicated that there was no difference in the sharing skills of the children belonging to joint or nuclear families, or children belonging to different socio-economic strata. No statistical significance was seen in the different tests namely independent T-test, post hoc tests, and one-way ANOVA analysis which were performed to determine statistical significance. No single test showed any statistical significance to determine which group of the family has better sharing skills. This may be due to a variety of factors that influence the sharing in children. Children with siblings were more influenced by the presence of an elder sibling and tend to share more which was seen in the most number of students but the results were not statistically significant. The sharing skills were also based on the improved altruistic behaviors of the parents which were displayed in the home settings. Another explanation could be due to the increased communication skills found in children as they age when compared to younger children supported by the study of Sudipta (2010). Children with siblings would be more likely to share due to more exposure to sharing behavior in the family and to parents' more frequent speech about the need to share. The results show, however, that there were no significant differences in sharing between children with and without siblings. This is supported by the findings of Freijo et al (2006) and Sudipta (2010). However, some studies involving children indicate that sibling status may influence the prosocial behavior of the younger sibling (Bryant & Crockenberg, 1980).

As with income, it was expected that prosocial behavior in very young children would increase with parental education. Across the entire sample, the results showed that the children with more educated parents shared food more frequently than toys. Parents with higher education may use more "concerted cultivation" parenting techniques, where they engage and are more interactive with children in contrast to children with less educated parents who may use techniques of "natural growth" (Lareau 2003), where distinct communication boundaries exist between parents and children. Moreover, neither education nor income was significantly associated with parents' altruism, affiliative tendency, or socialization goals.

Two other general patterns should be noted. First, food-sharing was more often associated with parents' prosocial tendencies and socialization goals than toy-sharing. Second, more associations emerged between younger children with older children. These tendencies may be because at early ages the first type of prosocial games parents play with their children involve food. In this study, it was found that there was no statistical significance in the different groups even though differences were noted in the scoring patterns supporting the hypothesis by modeling the environment and other behavior of the children and parents we can increase the sharing in children.

Conclusion

This was a pilot study, where only 227 normal school children participated in the study. The results were not found significant on the significance level $\alpha=0.05$ due to the small sample size and lots of variables that could not be controlled. Based on these results we can conclude that there is no difference in sharing between children belonging to different family types and belonging to different socio-economic strata. It was also found that sharing was the same in both educated and uneducated parents.

Limitations

The main limitation of the study was the small sample size. The scale used in the study was developed for the specific purpose of assessing sharing and proper standardization of the scale should be done. More parameters like the education of the parents, and sibling status affecting the study should also be taken into account for better judgment.

Future recommendation

A bigger study with a large sample should be done. Control the different parameters taking all factors into account. Proper standardization procedures of the scale should be followed.

Bibliography

1. Belgrave, F.Z. & Allison, K.W. (2010) African American psychology: from Africa to America. Thousand Oaks, CA Sage publications.
2. Benenson, J.E. Pascoe, J. & Radmore, N. (2007) Children's altruistic behaviour in the dictator game. *Evolution and human behaviour*, 28 (3), 168-175.
3. Brownell, C.A. Svetlova, M. & Nichols, S.R. (2009). To share or not to share: When do toddlers respond to another's needs? *Infancy*. 14(1), 117-130.
4. Bryant, B.K. & Crockenberg, S.B. (1980) Correlates and dimensions of prosocial behaviour: A study of female siblings with their mothers *Child Development*. 51(2). 529-544.
5. Clary, E.G. & Miller, J. (1986). Socialization and situational influences on sustained altruism. *Child Development*. 57(6), 1358-1369.
6. Dunn, J. & Munn, P. (1986a). Siblings and the development of prosocial behaviour. *International journal of behavioural Development*. 9(3), 265-284.
7. Dunn, J., & Mann, P. (1986b) Siblings quarrels and maternal intervention: Individual differences in understanding and aggression. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*. 27(5), 583-595.
8. Eisenberg, N. (1983). The socialization and development of empathy and prosocial behaviour (Special report). East Haddam, CT: The National Association for Humane and Environment Education.
9. Eisenberg, N., R.A., & Spinard, T.L. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg & R.M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional and personality development* (6 ed., pp. 646-718). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

10. Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P.H. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behaviour in children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Freijo, E.A., Olivia, A., Olabarrieta, F., Martin, L., Manzano, A., & Richards, M.P.M. (2006). Quality of family context or sibling status? Influences on cognitive development. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, 178(2), 153-164.
12. Hay, D.F., Caplan, M., Castle, J., & Stimson, C.A. (1991). Does sharing become increasingly “rational” in the second year of life? *Developmental Psychology*, 27(6), 987-993.
13. Hoffman, M.L. (1975). Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31(15), 937-943
14. Janssens, J.M.A., & Dekovic, M. (1997). Child rearing, prosocial moral reasoning and prosocial behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 20(3), 509-527.
15. Kasser, T., Ryan, R.M., Zax, M., & Sameroff, A.J. (1995). The relations of maternal and social environments to late adolescents’ materialistic and prosocial values. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(6), 907-914
16. Keller, H. (2007). *Cultures of infancy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
17. Keller, H., Kartner, J., Borke, J., Yovsi, R., & Kleis, A. (2005). Parenting styles and the development of the categorical self: A longitudinal study on mirror self-recognition in Cameroonian Nso and German families. *International Journal of Behavioural Development* 29(6), 496-504.
18. Kelly, D.C. (2006). Parents’ influence on youths’ civic behaviours: The civic context of the caregiving environment. *Families in Society*, 87(3), 447-45.
19. Kohn, M.L. (1963). Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 68(4), 471-480.
20. Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods : class, race and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
21. Low, S. (2009). Maintaining whiteness: The fear of other and niceness. *Transforming Anthropology*, 17(2), 79-92.
22. Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
23. Mehrabian, A. (1976). Questionnaire measures of affiliative tendency and sensitivity to rejection *Psychological Reports*, 38, 199-209.
24. Mehrabian, A. (1994). Evidence bearing on the affiliative tendency (MAFF) and sensitivity to rejection (MSR) scales. *Current Psychology*, 13(2), 97-117.
25. Mehrabian, A., & Norman, E. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality* 40(4), 525-543.
26. Meyer, J.A., & Hobson, R.P. (2004). Orientation in relation to self and other : the case of autism. *Interaction Studies*, 5(2), 221-224.
27. Over, H., Carpenter, M. (2009). Eighteen-month-old infants show increased helping following priming with affiliation. *Psychological Science*, 20(10), 1189-1193.
28. Perner, J., Ruffman, T., & Leekam, S.R. : (1994). Theory of mind is contagious : You catch it from your sibs. *Child Development*, 65(4), 1228-1238.
29. Piliavin, J.A., & Charng, H.-W. (1990). Altruism : A review of recent theory and research *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27-65.
30. Quinn, N. (2003). Cultural selves, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1001, 145-176.
31. Rowe, M.L., & Casillas, A. (Under review). Parental goals and talk with toddlers.
32. Smith, T.W. (2005). Age differences in social, civic and media variables, 1974-2004. College Park, MD: Center for information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, University of Maryland.
33. Sparks, A.D., Thornburg, K. R. Ispa, J.M., & Gray, M.M. (1984). Prosocial behaviours of young children related to parental childrearing attitudes. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, 15(4), 291-297.
34. Svetlova, M., Nichols, S.R., & Brownell, C.A. (In press). Toddlers’ prosocial behaviour : From Instrumental to empathic to altruistic helping. *Child Development*.
35. Toi, M., & Batson, C.D. (1982). More evidence that empathy is a source of altruistic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 281-292.
36. Warneken, F., Hare, B., Melis, A., Hanus, D., & Tomasello, M (2007). Spontaneous altruism by chimpanzees and young children. *PLoS Biology*, 5, 1414-1420.
37. Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2007). Helping and cooperation at 14 months of age. *Infancy*, 11, 271-294.
38. Zahn-Waxler, C., & Radke-Yarrow, M. (1982). The development of altruism : Alternative research strategies. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *The development of prosocial behaviour* (pp. 109-137). New York : Academic press.
39. Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R.A. (1979). Child rearing and children’s prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. *Child Development*, 50, 319-330.
40. Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., Wagner, E., & Chapman, M., (1992). Development of concern for others. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(1), 126-136.
41. Bryant BK, Crocker SB. Correlates and dimensions of prosocial behavior : a study of female siblings with their mothers. *Child Dev*, 1980 Jun; 51(2) : 529-44
42. Kojima Y’ Maternal regulation of sibling interactions in the preschool years : observational study in Japanese families. *Child Dev* 2000 Nov-Dec; 71(6): 1640-7
43. Brody GH, Stoneman Z, Gauger K. Parent-child relationships, family problems-solving behavior, and sibling relationship quality : the moderating role of sibling temperaments. *Child Dev*-1996 Jun;67(3): 1289-300
44. Kramer L Kowal AK Sibling relationship quality from birth to adolescence : the enduring contributions of friends. *Pediatr Nurs*. 1997 May-Jun;23(3):298-302

45. Leung AK Robson WL Sibling rivalry. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 1994 May; 35(4): 749-67
46. Meyers C Vipond Play and Social interactions between children with developmental disabilities and their siblings : a systematic literature review. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1988 Mar;29(2): 119-27
47. Dunn J Munn P. Sibling quarrels and maternal intervention : individual differences in understanding and aggression. *Child Dev*. 2010 Nov-Dec; 81(6) : 1814-27. Doi: 10.1111/j. 1467-8624.2010.01512

